

people, the greatest amount of vindictive and violent hatred of the American republic is to be found among the radicals. They are more insolent and overbear-

ing towards everything American than even the high nobility are. They are a species of British socialists, and are just as wild in their notions as the socialists of the Continent, or as those of this country, emanating from Brook Farm—a set of fanatics, who are as fanatical and tyrannical, in all their ideas, and who want to inflict their ridiculous notions on the whole community.

☞ The London Morning Chronicle shows its teeth in the following style:—

The change of members in the Tower Hamlets is highly creditable to the electors. Itinerant orators and philanthropists are the class of all others, who are least wanted in the House of Commons. The great constituency which has got rid of Mr. GEORGE THOMPSON, may, perhaps, even yet have scarcely appreciated aright its constitutional powers and responsibilities. Mr. BUTLER is, no doubt, a respectable man, but he is altogether unknown as a politician. Mr. THOMPSON was returned, in 1847, because the electors were tired of a worthy and popular gentleman whose political creed was comprised in devotion to *Low Rates*. It was thought that the Tower Hamlets were entitled to something more than a silent party vote in the House of Commons. The error of seeking for originality and independence in a professional agitator and philanthropist ought not to be too closely criticised. The electors have now discovered that the thunder of the platform falls dead on an educated and business-like assembly; that we are not in the time, they will probably look to the influence in the State can only be exercised through a statesman.

GEORGE THOMPSON.

The London correspondent of the New York Times says that George Thompson will probably represent some other borough in Parliament, now that he has lost the Tower Hamlets. This correspondent moreover says, that Mr. T's mission to America is partly, but not wholly, the result of his rejection. With such an admission as this by the Times, and the foregoing facts, it is not difficult to see the true causes of his rejection, we may put it down to his well known liberal and reformatory spirit at home. Such a man is as obnoxious to the Tories of Great Britain, as he was to the Tories in America, and both used his influence to defeat him. Those in America failed, but those in England temporarily succeeded. George Thompson, however, will yet be found advocating the cause of humanity in Parliament.—*Essex County Freeman.*

From the Massachusetts Spy.

DANIEL WEBSTER.

The Whig papers give glowing accounts of the reception Daniel Webster on his return to Marshfield, on Saturday afternoon. It was, undoubtedly, slow and imposing, because the hunkier Whigs who have used Mr. Webster, and expect to have

occasion to lose him further, have the means at their command to get up an imposing pageant whenever the necessities of the case require it. But we trust that they have not cheated themselves into the belief, and do not hope to cheat any others into the belief, that these demonstrations are the sincere outpourings of the feelings of any considerable portion of the people of Massachusetts. With a *very small* portion they may be sincere and honest; with a much larger number, they are encouraged, not because they are sincere, but because they are not so. It is no more than to say, as he says to his friends, and with the expectation of satisfying his friends, and securing their co-operation, and possibly, his, or, at least, preventing his opposition. But the great mass of the people have no part nor lot in them; they have nothe doctrines he has promulgated, and have no confidence whatever in him.

What, then, has led Daniel Webster himself, with all his self-love, can be deceived by these demonstrations. He knows and understands the New England character too well to suppose that the people have so entirely changed their principles in two years. He must know that, that there is no potent force in the efforts of a few individuals, no power in popular applause, and has so great a greed for it, that, for want of the substance, he is willing to clutch the shadow, and hug it to his bosom. Were it not so, surely he would not put himself in the way of these things, nor suffer them, especially at so inauspicious a time, when, as we have seen, the political friends have been put to the fairest of all tests, and they have spared him from them, almost as with one accord. Ten thousand pageants, with all the splendor which the wealth of State street or Wall street can confer on them, will do but little towards rubbing out this damning record. So long as he stands while all men make a mockery of him, he alone remains, dark, gloom and gloomy, saying by actions, louder than words can speak, 'All these things avail me nothing, so long as Mordecai sits in the gate.'

OWDING'S GREAT SPEECH.

The greatest speech which has yet been pronounced in Congress, was thundered in the ears of the slaves and doughfaces, who compose the majority of the great national menagerie—kept open at the Capitol, at such an enormous expense, and so few benefits—on the 23d of last month, by JOSEPH R. GIMMINS. He took the boldest and most radical ground against the compromise, and the Southern slaveholders, and dared the slave masters to make any vain motions, to their face, to execute their threats to put down free discussion on the slave question. He challenged them, then and there, to redeem their pledges to resist and discountenance all agitation of the slave question, and to stand forward as the condemned culprit.

He said, 'I stand forward at this time, in the words of truth, like an overplump, tight-rope man, the

How changed! Eight years ago, he was virtually expelled from Congress, for introducing the simple resolution in the House, that the Federal Government was not responsible for Slavery. Now he stands up before Slaves, and craves the wholesale truth down their throats. 'The Fugitive Slave Law is unconstitutional, is an outrage upon the rights of Freedmen, which, if enforced, will lead to civil war—it cannot be executed—it shall be repealed—sooner than have the North submit to such a degradation as to pass under the yoke of Slavery, and pay tribute to Slavery. For their runaway, he would see every Slaveholder in the nation hanged.' And the South and its dirt-cars were as meek as Moses, under Divine chastisement.

Thank God! One man has spoken at Washington, in a tone befitting the North. Now let this speech be followed up by similar demonstrations, by our friends in Congress, and by corresponding efforts by the people, and it is the last time a National Convention will attempt to force Slavery and the Gag upon a free people.

CHARLES SUMNER AND THE FUGITIVE SLAVE LAW.

Debate on Mr. Sumner's motion relative to the repeal of the Fugitive Slave Law.

U. S. SENATE, WEDNESDAY, JULY 28, 1852.

Mr. Sumner said—In asking the Senate to take up this resolution for consideration, I say nothing of its merits, nor of the arguments by which it may be maintained. Nor do I anticipate any objection to it on those grounds. All this will properly belong to the discussion, which the resolution is before the Senate. The single question now is, not on the resolution, but whether I shall be heard on it. As a Senator, under the responsibilities of my position, I have deemed it my duty to offer the resolution. I may seem to have postponed this duty to an inconvenient period of the session, but had I attempted it on an earlier day, I might have exposed myself to a charge of a different character.

It might have been said that, a new comer, and inexperienced in this scene, without deliberation, hastily, rashly, recklessly, I pushed this question before the country. This is not the case now. I have taken time, and in all the exercise of my most careful discretion, now ask for it the attention of the Senate. I shrink from the appeal founded on a trivial personal consideration, but should I be blamed for any delay later, I may add, that though in my seat daily, my bodily health for some time past, even to this very week, has not been equal to the service I have undertaken. I am not sure that it is now, but I desire to try, and now again say the question is, simply, whether I shall be heard.

In allowing me this privilege, I might say you do not commit yourselves in any way to the principle of the resolution, but you merely follow the ordinary usage of the Senate, and yield to a brother Senator the opportunity which he craves, in the practical discharge of his duty, to express convictions to his heart, and dear to a large number of his constituents. For the sake of these constituents, for my own sake, I now desire to be heard. Make such disposition of my resolution afterwards as you shall deem best. Visit upon me any degree of criticism, censure or displeasure, but do not deprive me of a hearing—Strike, but hear!

Mr. Mason. It is the right of any Senator to introduce into this body any subject which in his judgment is proper for legislation. There is a correlative right on the part of the Senate to consider it or not, as they may think proper. Now, sir, I object to the consideration of this resolution at this time; not from any objection to the resolution itself, but from the question involved in a resolution which any Senator upon his responsibility thinks proper to introduce. But I object to it, because it is manifest that at this time of the session the Senate can give it no further consideration than to hear the remarks that may be made upon it by the Senator who introduced it. It is not, then, introduced for any practical object; and because of its disturbing character, because, whenever it does come before the Senate, it comes in the form of a firebrand, I say that until the Senate is prepared to consider it and to pass upon it, I object to its consideration. Upon the question of taking up the resolution, I ask the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. Brooks said his State occupied a peculiar position on this subject. The people of Mississippi in the most formal and emphatic manner declared that a repeal or essential modification of the fugitive slave law would afford sufficient ground for a dissolution of the Union. This was no idle threat, but a solemn declaration, which will be carried into execution, with the approval of the whole South. He regarded the present proposition, therefore, as one to dissolve the Union, and he could not consent, courtesy or no courtesy, to entertain it at this stage of the session. The South would regard the repeal of the law as an act of bad faith, or one showing that no faith was to be reposed in the North—that Union with such a people was worse than no Union.

Mr. Charlton was sorry to differ again from the Senator from Massachusetts, on a question of courtesy.—The resolution presents a question to read this Union in pieces. His State was pledged that in case this law was repealed, it would withdraw from the Union, and all her citizens would stand by that pledge. The tables of both Houses were now covered with bills necessary to be acted on, to carry on the machinery of Government. Let the Senator look beyond his own coast, and he will see the American flag, not perhaps trailing in the dust, but at least mast, and American vessels and crews under the guard of British vessels.

We of the South are here prepared to a man to stand by our brethren of the North, and maintain them, come what may, in their rights. The South was well aware of what its costs would suffer from a war, but they thought not of that, when the rights of any portion of the American people were in jeopardy. He defines his position as a Union man, and avowed his determination to preserve the Union, and to stand by the Constitution, and to stand by the compromise. If this law be abolished, then he would say, 'My native land, good night!' Argument would be exhausted, and the South must rest on her arms.

I am not afraid of this resolution. Let it come up in its order. I am unwilling to gag the gentleman. I feel a personal respect for him, and I am willing to offer to him any courtesy in my power. But there is a point where courtesy ceases to be a virtue and becomes a crime.

Mr. President, it is my good fortune to be a Union democrat. I am not ashamed of my position. I know that I, as well as the great body of men with whom I have associated in Georgia, have been held up to public scorn and reproach, because we were willing to abide by this compromise—the fugitive slave law being the prominent feature of it. We were willing to do it. We did not stop to consider whether full justice had been done to us in these measures; but we saw in the effort here to compromise, a returning sense of justice; and we were not willing to lose our hold upon the Northern States, who had stood by us in good and in evil report. We were unwilling to haul down the banner of our country. We were ready to do battle for it as long as this compromise was observed by the North. That is the extent to which we will go. We have already said, and we say it again, we adopt this as a peace-offering. Repeat this pledge, and we are absolved. Break it, and Georgia is not true to herself if she continues dishonored in this confederacy. Now, sir, let them cast me where they please, I am a Union democrat. I believe in this glorious country. I love it with all my heart. It would bring tears to my eyes—the very thought that one of these States should withdraw from the Union, and that the great example of a free people who can govern themselves; and I think that the prophecy made to ancient Rome might as well be made to the constitution of the United States of America: 'While stands the Coliseum, Rome will stand; when falls the Coliseum, Rome will fall; and when Rome falls, the world will fall.' But still, Mr. President, I am not willing to go one inch beyond the line that has been drawn. Why, then, should I vote upon a principle of personal courtesy, to allow this resolution to be taken up out of its order? It is either useless, or worse than useless. It is useless if it fails to meet its object. It is worse than useless if it meets that object, because it dissolves the Union. Should I vote for it? No, I will not! I tell the Senator from Massachusetts, that in giving this vote I am on no personal disrespect for him. I have known him long. I acknowledge that I have received courtesies from him. But in a question of this character, where the interests of Georgia are at stake, I should feel myself recalcitrant to my State, recalcitrant to my constituents, and recalcitrant to the great body of the nation, that if the fugitive slave law is repealed, then the gentleman may say, as I certainly will say, 'My native land, good night! good night to all your prospects; good night to all your greatness. Come what will—come what may—we have exhausted the argument, and will stand by our arms.'

Mr. Shields. Mr. President, I do not know that I understand the question before the Senate. I have just come in.

The President stated the question to be on the postponement of all prior orders, for the purpose of taking up a resolution offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. (Mr. Sumner.)

Mr. Shields called for the reading of the resolution again.

The resolution was accordingly read.

Mr. Shields. Mr. President, as a Senator of this body, I am decidedly opposed to this resolution, and I shall vote against it. But that is not the question we are now considering. It occurs to me that there has been some error in the way in which this subject by honorable Senators representing the South. I felt that there was great force in what fell from the honorable Senator from Virginia (Mr. Mason) yesterday, that being brought in at this late stage of the session, at a time when we are almost overwhelmed with

business, and its being a mere abstract question—for I hold it is only that, and it is only intended to give the Senator from Massachusetts an opportunity of being heard—it is a great pity that the time of the Senate should be wasted upon such a question. I regret very much that the honorable Mr. Mason, who introduced this resolution, has deemed it necessary to die either in his position or to himself to bring this question forward; but having done so, the only question now is, will you permit him to be heard upon it? Will you deprive a Senator of this body—a subject that may interest him deeply—of the privilege of being heard?

Now, sir, I have said in this body, and I have listened to treason spoken here by honorable Senators; and yet we have listened patiently. I ask honorable Senators from the South to consider, can anything be gained by preventing a man from being heard upon a question of this kind? Can you gain anything by stifling his mouth upon this question? I am as decidedly opposed to agitation as any man in this body. And while I shall stand against any law to modify or change the fugitive slave law, unless it be from defect found in its operation, and to strengthen it, yet, at the same time, if there is a motion made to lay it upon the table, I shall vote against it. I will hear him and hear what he has to say.

More than that: I have a peculiar curiosity at this stage of affairs, and I want to know what the Senator has to say in the coming canvass. And I take it for granted that my honorable friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) means to give an *expose* of their opinions, and of their intended proceedings. I want the principles of that third party exposed to the public gaze. For one, I will not stifle it—not for a moment. I would give it, on the contrary, all the encouragement I can. I want men to be classified in the coming election; and I want to see how many of our citizens in the Northern States, and in my own State, are disposed to go in for the repeal of the fugitive slave law. We lose nothing by classification, in my humble opinion. The two great parties are now arrayed in a position; and I want to see this third party, that makes this their hobby, so as to know what strength they can muster in the United States.

Now, sir, I would suggest this: I shall vote against the resolution; I shall vote against any re-agitation of the question; but, at the same time, I mean never to give my vote in this body to prevent any man that is honored with a seat in this body, let him come from what quarter he may, from being heard here upon any question—never. I will hear him; I do not care what he says here. I would, therefore, suggest that the honorable Senator (Mr. Sumner) postpone his resolution until Saturday, as it will then interfere with none of the legitimate business of the body; and that we all agree to give him a hearing upon that day. I have not the least idea that his speech will ever reach the Union of the United States under. (Laughter.)

Mr. Gwin. Mr. President, I differ entirely from the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Shields) with regard to the propriety of extending courtesy to every Senator upon such subjects as he chooses to bring before this body. If the Senator from Massachusetts were to introduce a resolution here to instruct the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill to dissolve this Union, I would declare whether the Senator from Illinois would vote in favor of his having an opportunity of speaking upon such a resolution? Now, sir, I recollect very distinctly, some ten years ago, that a gentleman from Massachusetts (Hon. J. Q. Adams), for introducing a memorial bringing before the other House of Congress a proposition in favor of dissolving this Union—there were two weeks' discussion upon it, and it came very near being carried and expelled from the House.

Mr. Shields. Mr. President, if the gentleman from California will permit me, I will state a very reasonable proposition—a proposition flagrantly unreasonable—of course the Senate should not entertain for a moment—of course not; and I should not vote for such a thing as that. I have already said that I shall vote against this resolution, and that I shall vote against any bill which favors a proposition of the kind.

Mr. Gwin. Mr. President, I look upon the two propositions as one and the same. I think the resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts is a question which he thought the people of the United States considered of far more importance than speeches on the repeal of the fugitive slave law. He wanted to hear no premeditated speeches in the Senate. They could be made elsewhere. He would vote against taking the resolution up.

Mr. Butler. I suppose I may consider myself included in the appeal which has been made to the gentleman from the South by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Shields), and perhaps no one more so, because of interfering with this debate. I have stood openly here, and seemed under the censure of the Senate at the time I did so, and have opposed any vote or measure which looked like the suppression, or attempt to suppress, petitions or the right of debate. I have long seen that this effort to arrest agitation by attempting to exclude petitions or to exclude debate is vain. I know it will go on. I believe the honorable Senator is pledged to agitation; however, that may be another matter. Therefore, I would be perfectly willing, as he is bound to do it, and under very high obligations to his constituents, to give him an opportunity to speak upon this subject at any time when the other side can be heard. Give us a 'fair field and a free fight' upon this subject, and I will do nothing. But I feel myself embarrassed upon this subject by the peculiar attitude and peculiar juncture of affairs at this time. I feel that I am in a conflict between a sense of duty, I may say, to every Senator, and a sense of courtesy; because, if this subject be taken up, the subject cannot be discussed without allusions, and the Senator himself will be bound to make allusions to South Carolina and her laws.

Mr. Sumner. (in a low voice.) I do not intend to do it.

Mr. Butler. Well, sir, I may get clear, perhaps, but you will give it to other gentlemen. (Laughter.)

Mr. Weller. (in his seat.) I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Butler. No, sir; I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Butler. No, sir; I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

business, and its being a mere abstract question—for I hold it is only that, and it is only intended to give the Senator from Massachusetts an opportunity of being heard—it is a great pity that the time of the Senate should be wasted upon such a question. I regret very much that the honorable Mr. Mason, who introduced this resolution, has deemed it necessary to die either in his position or to himself to bring this question forward; but having done so, the only question now is, will you permit him to be heard upon it? Will you deprive a Senator of this body—a subject that may interest him deeply—of the privilege of being heard?

Now, sir, I have said in this body, and I have listened to treason spoken here by honorable Senators; and yet we have listened patiently. I ask honorable Senators from the South to consider, can anything be gained by preventing a man from being heard upon a question of this kind? Can you gain anything by stifling his mouth upon this question? I am as decidedly opposed to agitation as any man in this body. And while I shall stand against any law to modify or change the fugitive slave law, unless it be from defect found in its operation, and to strengthen it, yet, at the same time, if there is a motion made to lay it upon the table, I shall vote against it. I will hear him and hear what he has to say.

More than that: I have a peculiar curiosity at this stage of affairs, and I want to know what the Senator has to say in the coming canvass. And I take it for granted that my honorable friend from Massachusetts (Mr. Sumner) means to give an *expose* of their opinions, and of their intended proceedings. I want the principles of that third party exposed to the public gaze. For one, I will not stifle it—not for a moment. I would give it, on the contrary, all the encouragement I can. I want men to be classified in the coming election; and I want to see how many of our citizens in the Northern States, and in my own State, are disposed to go in for the repeal of the fugitive slave law. We lose nothing by classification, in my humble opinion. The two great parties are now arrayed in a position; and I want to see this third party, that makes this their hobby, so as to know what strength they can muster in the United States.

Now, sir, I would suggest this: I shall vote against the resolution; I shall vote against any re-agitation of the question; but, at the same time, I mean never to give my vote in this body to prevent any man that is honored with a seat in this body, let him come from what quarter he may, from being heard here upon any question—never. I will hear him; I do not care what he says here. I would, therefore, suggest that the honorable Senator (Mr. Sumner) postpone his resolution until Saturday, as it will then interfere with none of the legitimate business of the body; and that we all agree to give him a hearing upon that day. I have not the least idea that his speech will ever reach the Union of the United States under. (Laughter.)

Mr. Gwin. Mr. President, I differ entirely from the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Shields) with regard to the propriety of extending courtesy to every Senator upon such subjects as he chooses to bring before this body. If the Senator from Massachusetts were to introduce a resolution here to instruct the Judiciary Committee to inquire into the expediency of reporting a bill to dissolve this Union, I would declare whether the Senator from Illinois would vote in favor of his having an opportunity of speaking upon such a resolution? Now, sir, I recollect very distinctly, some ten years ago, that a gentleman from Massachusetts (Hon. J. Q. Adams), for introducing a memorial bringing before the other House of Congress a proposition in favor of dissolving this Union—there were two weeks' discussion upon it, and it came very near being carried and expelled from the House.

Mr. Shields. Mr. President, if the gentleman from California will permit me, I will state a very reasonable proposition—a proposition flagrantly unreasonable—of course the Senate should not entertain for a moment—of course not; and I should not vote for such a thing as that. I have already said that I shall vote against this resolution, and that I shall vote against any bill which favors a proposition of the kind.

Mr. Gwin. Mr. President, I look upon the two propositions as one and the same. I think the resolution introduced by the Senator from Massachusetts is a question which he thought the people of the United States considered of far more importance than speeches on the repeal of the fugitive slave law. He wanted to hear no premeditated speeches in the Senate. They could be made elsewhere. He would vote against taking the resolution up.

Mr. Butler. I suppose I may consider myself included in the appeal which has been made to the gentleman from the South by the Senator from Illinois (Mr. Shields), and perhaps no one more so, because of interfering with this debate. I have stood openly here, and seemed under the censure of the Senate at the time I did so, and have opposed any vote or measure which looked like the suppression, or attempt to suppress, petitions or the right of debate. I have long seen that this effort to arrest agitation by attempting to exclude petitions or to exclude debate is vain. I know it will go on. I believe the honorable Senator is pledged to agitation; however, that may be another matter. Therefore, I would be perfectly willing, as he is bound to do it, and under very high obligations to his constituents, to give him an opportunity to speak upon this subject at any time when the other side can be heard. Give us a 'fair field and a free fight' upon this subject, and I will do nothing. But I feel myself embarrassed upon this subject by the peculiar attitude and peculiar juncture of affairs at this time. I feel that I am in a conflict between a sense of duty, I may say, to every Senator, and a sense of courtesy; because, if this subject be taken up, the subject cannot be discussed without allusions, and the Senator himself will be bound to make allusions to South Carolina and her laws.

Mr. Sumner. (in a low voice.) I do not intend to do it.

Mr. Butler. Well, sir, I may get clear, perhaps, but you will give it to other gentlemen. (Laughter.)

Mr. Weller. (in his seat.) I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Butler. No, sir; I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Sumner. (in a low voice.) I do not intend to do it.

Mr. Butler. Well, sir, I may get clear, perhaps, but you will give it to other gentlemen. (Laughter.)

Mr. Weller. (in his seat.) I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Butler. No, sir; I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Or is it a mere opportunity of making before the Senate an ostentatious display which is desired? Is it to make the proceedings of this Senate the vehicle of communication throughout the United States, and wash deeper and deeper the channels through which flow the angry waters of agitation? If that is his object, I must be allowed to say that when he undertakes to agitate, perhaps the current cannot be controlled without some counteracting influence to go out with his speech. I will say that much. The gentleman's speech must have an influence. I suppose it is intended to have an influence. I therefore feel extremely embarrassed to know how to vote in accordance with what I have heretofore said. I do not intend to repeat what I have said, or to exclude it from the Senate of the United States, or to exclude it from a speech merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

Mr. Butler. No, sir; I do not know how it can be discussed without such allusions. However, I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts would not like to have it said that he is playing the part of the rhetorician, and that he is playing the part of the orator before the Senate of the United States, and that he is speaking merely. If he intends anything, he ought to have before him all the responsibility of a Senator, especially a Senator from Massachusetts. He ought to have before him the dignity of purpose. Does he intend to refer this resolution to the Judiciary Committee with a view of having it acted upon?

intellectual advantages. Other men—your Buchanans and Douglasses—men in New York and Ohio, and other States, were in a like category of shame and degradation.

Mr. Remond remarked, in continuation, that he had had moments when he had despaired of ever beholding the slaves of our land made free; but recent events and successes led him to think that if ever there was an indication that God's hand led a moral movement, it was in this great work. He believed when our community were brought to think that slavery degraded them as well as the black race, the work of emancipation would begin, and the indications were that this conviction was fast coming upon the public mind. Our labors, our prayers and deeds must continue, and the day of jubilee will the sooner be consummated.

With appropriate prefatory remarks by the President, Miss Lucy Stone was introduced to the company. Miss Stone remarked that she felt, in view of the able speakers about her, like sinking into the remotest corner; but when she thought of the oppression that had come upon her brothers, if ever there was a reason that woman's voice should be raised up, it was in such a case as this. While we rejoiced at West Indian emancipation, she could not but feel depressed that this occasion was not one also for congratulation at American emancipation. In more than one cabin of our land were Uncle Toms; in the embrace of more than one Legree in our South land were other Cassys; and it was for those who had ever felt an interest in the anti-slavery cause, who had been in attendance at the meetings, listening to the words that burn, to renew to-day the determination to labor in the cause, so that we might hasten the day when fetters should no more be recognized in our land.

CHARLES C. BURLEIGH, of Connecticut, rejoiced that such an occasion could draw together such an audience, as exhibiting the interest in the cause, and he hoped the labors of the day would not be in vain upon the minds of any who had been brought together. We stand to-day the representatives of once the West Indian slave, now the West Indian free man, and it were proper for us to rejoice with him. The event celebrated was the announcement of a great principle, and hence the terror it has created in the hearts of slaveholders. And why is it that these slaveholders would have believed that the act of the British government was a failure, tending neither to social advantage nor individual happiness? It is because of the example which must be set to our own country. The very opposition and disfavor of such men was evidence presumptive that there was something worthy of commendation, something deserving of men's praise and benediction, in the great act of Britain. When he saw this opposition, he was led to believe that the system of American slavery is shaken to its foundation. He would not argue whether the planters of the West Indian islands exported the same quantity of sugar or rum as before the liberation; it was sufficient for him to know that beasts had been turned into men. How many barrels of sugar, he would like to know, were the equivalent for the freedom of a single immortal being? Let those who were disposed earlier upon the statistics of the productions of those islands before and since the act of emancipation. It was enough for him to know that thousands had been set free, raised from degradation, made glad in the light of liberty; and, compared with such a fact, no calculation of mercantile success weighed the least iota.

British emancipation had demonstrated the power of the written word of truth—the almightiness of a persistence in what is right. Let this be the lesson, then, we learn from that act. No matter from what source emanates the word, no matter how unimportant the speaker, we know that the barriers of the slave system must eventually give way before it. Hence, let those who are here to-day be mindful of their strength, and so use it that we, too, shall soon have our day of emancipation.

Rev. THOMAS PARKER followed, saying this was a great and important occasion. This act of the British government is one of the exceptional acts in the history of the governments of the world. It is an instance of one great nation pausing in its course, and, at an expense of a hundred millions of dollars, emancipating eight hundred thousand slaves. From the day when Cyrus revoked the decree that sent the people of Judaea into slavery, there has been no such act as that of the British government. But if you watch the course of events in Europe, hitherto as now, you will find that governments never led in such works. It is the people themselves who are the factors of all great measures. It was so in this case; the people, by their intelligence and advancement, compelled the action of the government. Slavery has been of slow extinction in Europe, and in instances which Mr. Parker gave, the remark was fully illustrated. In America, we have been steadfastly kept from knowing the truth of emancipation in the West Indies by our newspapers, which have taken great pains to conceal the real facts. Even the people of New England were but ill-informed of the actual condition of those islands.

It might be, as was often asserted, that there was not so great an exportation of products as before the act of emancipation. The circumstances of the condition of the workers might account for such a variation. If but two hours' labor per day were necessary for the support of each colored man, he knew not why he should toil longer. When the planters of those islands complained to Sir John Russell that they produced not so much rum, that they had not so much sugar, as before the act of emancipation, the reply was, 'I do not know about that, but I do know that eight hundred thousand men are in a very much better condition.'

Mr. Parker followed with instances of the growing anti-slavery sentiment in England, and the retrograde movement in America, alluding, among other things, to the recent reception of a Baltimore slaveholder in the pulpits of Boston, and the rumored call by a Unitarian Society in this vicinity of the Rev. Theodore Clapp of New Orleans, who had become notorious by his defence of slavery, to a temporary acceptance of his pulpit, while their own minister was refreshing himself abroad. But the religious silence of this great assembly told us there was still a power which would urge on the anti-slavery cause. The events of the political world, also, taught us there was a growing anti-slavery sentiment among the mass of the people. The vote for Mr. Webster in the Baltimore Convention gave evidence of this, and other indications were equally conclusive.

In a review of the difficulties which impeded the progress of the anti-slavery cause, Mr. P. remarked that if Boston thought that to-morrow it could make money by the abolition of slavery, it would do it. It is this great pecuniary consideration, which, in part, overshadows our work. Along with this, the faltering of our public men in their course of duty. Parties had made great professions, and in their practice fallen far short of their promises. The Whig party was a signal instance of this; and he regretted to say, some of the leaders of the Free Soil organization had not done what was expected of them. In this connection, the recent attempted speech of Charles Sumner was cited, and though still expressing confidence in Mr. Sumner, and his purpose to do his duty, yet he felt he had yielded to the South what he never should have allowed. He had long been convinced that seven-tenths of the leaders of any party would prove faithless, while seven-tenths of the people would remain steadfast. But, whatever might be the course of parties, or the action of individuals, our duty was clear—to labor on for the emancipation of the slave population of our land, rejoicing at last on our own occasion of jubilee.

Remarks followed from Messrs. Garrison, Parker, Remond, Burleigh, and Rand, of Milton, upon the condition of the colored population of the West Indies in connection with the exports of those islands before and since the act of liberation.

'Freedom's Summons,' a song by the 'Lynn Band,' followed from the whole company, when, at 11:20 o'clock, there was a cessation of the addresses till 3 o'clock.

At the appointed hour in the afternoon, there were assembled at least fifteen hundred people, when the exercises were opened by the spirited recitation, by Mr. Garrison, of the following admirable original composition:—

THE SLAVE-CATCHER.

BY REV. JOHN PIERPONT.

TUNE—'Soots who hae.'

Children of the Pilgrim flock!
Of shots from the Pilgrim stock,
Planted first on Plymouth rock,
By the sarging maine of fate,
When upon that shore they dwelt,
When upon that rock they knelt,
Would those men have died, and felt
Slavery's galling chain?

When they all were kneeling there,
When the incense of their prayer
Rose upon the frosty air—
From a wigwag's shade
Had they heard the savage call,
'Hunt us down upon fleeing trail!
Seize and hold him, each and all!
Would they have obeyed?

Had they done it, would they dare
Kneel again, and breathe a prayer
To the God they worshipped there?
Had they prayed, would He,
Who their steps had guided here,
Who his guardian wing had spread
Over their defenceless head,
On the wintry sea—

His all-gracious ear have bowed?
Had they called on him aloud,
Would the column and the cloud,
Once to Israel given,
Have descended, as their guide
Through those forests, dark and wide,
Where to thee, O God, they cried,
And were heard of Heaven?

Hark! that savage call we hear!
Now 'tis ringing in our ear!
See! the panting trail is near!
Shall we play the hound?
Shall we join the unleashed pack,
Yelping on a brother's track?
Shall we seize and drag him back,
Fainting, bleeding, bound?

Not a drop of blood in veins!
Yes!—when, in our blood-red veins,
Not a drop of blood remains
From those Pilgrim men!
Yes!—when we our backs shall strip,
That what blood we have may drip
For the lordings of the whip—
Then, and not till then!

Another ode, entitled 'Right On!' to the tune of 'Lenox,' was then sung in concert, when Dr. Farrar, of Maine, was introduced, who indulged in personal reminiscences, and said, among other things, he believed the time was coming when the honest Southerner, in view of the great act of emancipation that then had taken place, would stretch his arms across Mason and Dixon's line, to grasp the hand of William Lloyd Garrison, or his representative, to congratulate him for the brave and hearty words he had spoken in behalf of the great cause. He believed, also, that there was soon to be a great change even in the public sentiment of the South, and slavery would be aided in its overthrow by five-sixths of the white population who were non-slaveholders.

Mr. Garrison followed, and read extracts, with appropriate comments, from published accounts of the success of emancipation in the West Indies.

John C. Wyman, of Dedham, was the next speaker, discussing the probability of any cessation of the agitation upon the slave question, and quoting with effect the prior declarations of Webster and others upon the necessity of agitation for moral and political purposes. Agitation gave independence to our country, and agitation would give secure the emancipation of the colored race in our midst. In the course of his remarks, he paid a deserved tribute to the fearlessness of Joshua R. Giddings, who had boldly declared he meant to agitate, and told his slaveholding auditors to do what they could to oppose him.

James Freeman Clark followed, and alluded to the former custom of all who were about to utter a peculiar pro-slavery sentiment to say, 'We are as much opposed to slavery as any one,' though they made the remark to cover the final extermination of any really earnest conviction that might be felt on the subject. What is the present position of these same individuals? They were opposed to all anti-slavery action. He did not know but that it was God's providence thus to rid the anti-slavery cause of its hindrances, that it might the sooner work out its destiny. The times were ripe for anti-slavery discussion. Among the most unexpected acts that had come to the cause—as though God's own hand had directed it—was the book, 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' which was exerting an untold influence upon the nation. That book, he believed, was an inspired one. Mr. C. gave some details as to the conception of this work, and the effect it was having upon different individuals. Among others who were deeply affected, was Mr. Rufus Choate, who, notwithstanding his desire not to acknowledge its touching narrative, yet could not help shedding tears—iron tears they might be—over its history, although he gave evidence of his old nature, by exclaiming, as he

